

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

8 JAMAL DAMON HENDRIX,

3:15-cv-00155-MMD-WGC

9 Plaintiff,

ORDER

10 vs.

Re: ECF Nos. 83, 113

11 STATE OF NEVADA, *et al.*,

12 Defendants.  
13

14  
15 Before the court are two motions for leave to file under seal various documents submitted in  
16 connection with Defendants' partial motion for summary judgment. (ECF Nos. 83, 113.) In the first  
17 motion (ECF No. 83), Defendants' seek leave to file Exhibits A-E, H-K, which contain portions of  
18 Plaintiff's medical records under seal. In the second motion (ECF No. 113), Defendants seek leave to  
19 file under seal Exhibit A to their reply brief, which also contains portions of Plaintiff's medical records.

20 "Historically, courts have recognized a general right to inspect and copy public records and  
21 documents, including judicial records and documents." *See Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu*,  
22 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). "Throughout our  
23 history, the open courtroom has been a fundamental feature of the American judicial system. Basic  
24 principles have emerged to guide judicial discretion respecting public access to judicial proceedings.  
25 These principles apply as well to the determination of whether to permit access to information contained  
26 in court documents because court records often provide important, sometimes the only, bases or  
27 explanations for a court's decision." *Oliner v. Kontrabecki*, 745 F.3d 1024, 1025 (9th Cir. 2014)  
28 (quoting *Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. v. F.T.C.*, 710 F.2d 1165, 1177 (6th Cir. 1983)).

///

1 Documents that have been traditionally kept secret, including grand jury transcripts and warrant  
2 materials in a pre-indictment investigation, come within an exception to the general right of public  
3 access. *See Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1178. Otherwise, “a strong presumption in favor of access is the  
4 starting point.” *Id.* (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). “The presumption of access is ‘based  
5 on the need for federal courts, although independent—indeed, particularly because they are  
6 independent—to have a measure of accountability and for the public to have confidence in the  
7 administration of justice.’” *Center for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Group, LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092, 1096 (9th  
8 Cir. 2016), *cert. denied*, 137 S.Ct. 38 (Oct. 3, 2016) (quoting *United States v. Amodeo (Amodeo II)*, 71  
9 F.3d 1044, 1048 (2nd Cir. 1995); *Valley Broad Co. v. U.S. Dist. Court-D. Nev.*, 798 F.2d 1289, 1294  
10 (9th Cir. 1986)).

11 There are two possible standards a party must address when it seeks to file a document under  
12 seal: the compelling reasons standard or the good cause standard. *See Center for Auto Safety*, 809 F.3d  
13 at 1096-97. Under the compelling reasons standard, “a court may seal records only when it finds ‘a  
14 compelling reason and articulate[s] the factual basis for its ruling, without relying on hypothesis or  
15 conjecture.” *Id.* (quoting *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1179). “The court must then ‘conscientiously balance[  
16 ] the competing interests of the public and the party who seeks to keep certain judicial records secret.’”  
17 *Id.* “What constitutes a ‘compelling reason’ is ‘best left to the sound discretion of the trial court.’” *Id.*  
18 (quoting *Nixon v. Warner Comm., Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 599 (1978)). “Examples include when a court  
19 record might be used to ‘gratify private spite or promote public scandal,’ to circulate ‘libelous’  
20 statements, or ‘as sources of business information that might harm a litigant’s competitive standing.’”  
21 *Id.* (quoting *Nixon*, 435 U.S. at 598-99).

22 *Center for Auto Safety* described the good cause standard, on the other hand, as the exception to  
23 public access that had been applied to “sealed materials attached to a discovery motion unrelated to the  
24 merits of a case.” *Id.* (citing *Phillips ex rel. Estates of Byrd v. Gen. Motors Corp.*, 307 F.3d 1206, 1213-  
25 14 (9th Cir. 2002)). “The ‘good cause language comes from Rule 26(c)(1), which governs the issuance  
26 of protective orders in the discovery process: ‘The court may, for good cause, issue an order to protect  
27 a party or person from annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, or undue burden or expense.’” *Id.* (citing  
28 Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c)).

1       The Ninth Circuit has clarified that the key in determining which standard to apply in assessing  
2 a motion for leave to file a document under seal is whether the documents proposed for sealing  
3 accompany a motion that is “more than tangentially related to the merits of a case.” *Center for Auto*  
4 *Safety*, 809 F.3d at 1101. If that is the case, the compelling reasons standard is applied. If not, the good  
5 cause standard is applied.

6       Here, Defendants seek to file exhibits under seal in connection with their motion for summary  
7 judgment which is unquestionably “more than tangentially related to the merits of a case.” Therefore,  
8 the compelling reasons standard applies. This court, and others within the Ninth Circuit, have recognized  
9 that the need to protect medical privacy qualifies as a “compelling reason” for sealing records. *See, e.g.,*  
10 *San Ramon Regional Med. Ctr., Inc. v. Principal Life Ins. Co.*, 2011 WL89931, at \*n.1 (N.D. Cal. Jan.  
11 10, 2011); *Abbey v. Hawaii Employers Mut. Ins. Co.*, 2010 WL4715793, at \* 1-2 (D. HI. Nov. 15,  
12 2010); *G. v. Hawaii*, 2010 WL 267483, at \*1-2 (D.HI. June 25, 2010); *Wilkins v. Ahern*, 2010  
13 WL3755654 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 24, 2010); *Lombardi v. TriWest Healthcare Alliance Corp.*, 2009 WL  
14 1212170, at \* 1 (D.Ariz. May 4, 2009). This is because a person’s medical records contain sensitive and  
15 private information about their health. While a plaintiff puts certain aspects of his medical condition at  
16 issue when he files an action alleging deliberate indifference to a serious medical need under the Eighth  
17 Amendment, that does not mean that the entirety of his medical records filed in connection with a  
18 motion (which frequently contain records that pertain to unrelated medical information) need be  
19 unnecessarily broadcast to the public. In other words, the plaintiff’s interest in keeping his sensitive  
20 health information confidential outweighs the public’s need for direct access to the medical records.

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28

1 Here, the referenced exhibits contain Plaintiff's sensitive health information, medical history,  
2 and treatment records. Balancing the need for the public's access to information regarding Plaintiff's  
3 medical history, treatment, and condition against the need to maintain the confidentiality of Plaintiff's  
4 medical records weighs in favor of sealing these exhibits. Therefore, Defendants' motions (ECF Nos.  
5 83, 113) are **GRANTED**.

6 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

7 DATED: November 17, 2017.

8 

9 

---

WILLIAM G. COBB  
10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28